



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/792,186 | 03/03/2004 | Mark Shu | M190.148.101 / P-11480.00 | 4896 |
| 25281 | 7590 | 10/19/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA | | | STEWART, ALVIN J | |
| FIFTH STREET TOWERS | | | | |
| 100 SOUTH FIFTH STREET, SUITE 2250 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402 | | | 3774 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/19/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/792,186 | SHU ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Alvin J. Stewart | 3774 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-31 and 54-58.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
_____.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

10/15/09

/Alvin J Stewart/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3774

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The Examiner believes that the prior art still reads on the claimed subject matter. The Examiner believes that independent claim 1 is not positively claiming what the Applicant's representative is trying to say in the applicant's remarks. For example, it seems like the Applicant's representative is trying to claim two open spaces (first radial spacing and second radial spacing) created by the position of the suture band over the rim. However, the claims are not clearly disclosing the above subject matter. For example, the Examiner is interpreting the first radial spacing as a physical structure and not an open space between the rim and the suture band. The way that the Applicant's representative is claiming the first radial spacing has been interpreted by the Examiner as a name and not literally as a specific characteristic of the claimed name (first radial spacing). For the moment the Examiner does not need to find an open space between the rim and the suture band because is not positively claiming that open space.

The Applicant's representative must add structure limitations like below in order to clearly claim an open space created by two different radii and by the rim and the suture band.

The Applicant's representative must enter limitations like the following: the Applicant's representative must claim that the rim has a first radius and a second radius, wherein one of the radius extends deeper than the other radius. Also must disclose that the suture band covers the rim and that a radial open space is created in the first radius and second radius when the suture band covers the rim, and wherein relative to a circumferential interface between the rim and the suture band, the radial open space between the rim and the suture band decreases from a first radial open space to a second radial open space.

The applicant's representative should enter limitations like the above in order to overcome the rejection made by the Alonso reference. The Examiner believes that the limitations made by the Applicant's representative should positively claim the open spaces in order to distinguish the prior art from the application.